



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,185	02/14/2007	Bernd Deissmann	026032-4991	6627
22428	7590	08/17/2009	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			CRANMER, LAURIE K	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW				3636
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/17/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/571,185	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DEISSMANN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Laurie K. Cranmer	<b>Art Unit</b> 3636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 19-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-12, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 13-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/9/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Drawings***

The formal drawings described in the Remarks section of the Preliminary amendment of 5/10/06 have not been received.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9-11, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liu et al.

The seat is 14, the back is 12, the first fastening is 16, the second fastening is 18, the diagonal fastening is 48, the lower seat structure is 30+44, the normal position of the seat is seen in Figs. 1 and 2, the folded position of the backrest part is seen in Fig. 3, the lowered position is seen in Fig. 4, the entry position is seen in Fig. 5, the first actuator operates pivot lock 34, which then longitudinally displaces the diagonal fastening 48 (see Fig. 4, and col. 3, lines 12-20), the second actuator operates latch 44 to separate the seat part at the second fastening 18 (see col. 4, lines 13-17), regarding claim 17, the triggering means is the handle to operate latch 44 (col. 4, lines 13-17) and regarding claim 18, the control device is the handle to operate latch 44 (col. 4, lines 13-17). Note that the control device and triggering means as recited in claims 17 and 18 are required to release and "one" of several items.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Daniels.

Daniels teaches an electrically driven actuator 110 for a seat to be old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Liu device such that the actuator were electrically driven as taught to be old by Daniels thereby providing the obvious advantage and predictable results of greater convenience for the user.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 13-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 19-22 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art fails to teach a seat for a motor vehicle including, *inter alia*, a monitor configured to selectively prevent the diagonal fastener from being released when the seat is in the entry position.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pesta et al, Hecht et al, Schaefer et al, Bonk, Roth et al, Habedank, Salani et al, Tame (285), and Tame (581) all teach device similar to that of the instant invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie K. Cranmer whose telephone number is (571) 272-6855. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laurie K. Cranmer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3636

/Laurie K. Cranmer/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3636